

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1 and 5 are not related to patentability as they are only for overcoming the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 for lack of antecedent basis for certain words. With these corrections, claims 2-4 and 6 are also in an appropriate dependent form for allowance.


The drawings are objected for failing to discuss reference (131) of Fig. 1 and (208) in Fig. 2. An amendment to the specification has been made to explicitly include a description of the memory module as represented by the reference (131) in Fig. 1. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner on his objection against the reference (208) as it has been described in the specification on page 6, line 12, where it is stated that "Specifically, in block 208, NumberOfRepeat(SymbolCnt) is set equal to M." No amendment is needed to further provide additional description for this element represented by the reference (208).

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this application in an allowable form. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are drawn to novel subject matter, patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The Examiner is therefore, respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Should the Examiner deem that any further clarification is desirable, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Howard Chen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,615

Duane Morris LLP
One Market Street
Spear Tower, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-1104
Telephone: (415) 371-2200
Facsimile: (415) 371-2201